28. - Zurie . 3. 715

men his Furtille

the service the referred to me you your a road in the service to the service of the service in the service of t

able or see the ment of Here peaks ormed in Carlon when the construction of the constr

part was is no doubt that Caylor received two consignments

plants, one in 1876 and the other in 1877. He is also culture

that we one thomas whether there were both planted at thereologode,

when they was planted in the separate books there, or white the record

what they was planted in the separate books there, or white the

what we was planted at the separate books arraignment was the

trees on theoretizate on the durwor of both arraignment one.

There is no seed sent from theoretizate is descentizable.

There is no descent from theoretizate is descentized.

be sent 400 seeds a tripapere in a bordism ease is. 858.

The letter late: free of the sent of the sen

But is not all this sumewhat superfluence so for as the Sugapore tees are concerned. Lingapore received plants direct from Kew in 1876. Rulley says these all dead but Hurlin said they dud not all direct to disappore in 1877. So tingapore, like Ceylor, received plants of both consignments.

bre have always regarded the second consignments to Caylon and dingapore as Crossis trees. But quite recently there has stated that it has no record that crossis plants?

Ever became file to send out:

Triments steelements of which you goods was based or date supplied by Byer in 1880 or 1881. We is true had been bet here cross trees, but or the theodo to atalia "to me time cross arrived we had done with thereo"; " we saved to have a bordion except to do justice to cross". On here gave half the plant to Dall of Cheller more, to definite to here when the public arrays or, suppressely of their never dutinted his plant.

The extraordinan thing about this introduction of there is that:

New never wrote any account of to. Type furnished data to Trimen

Le wrote his account of 1881, a when in 1846 (!) sew put out

buling of other cultishow, way simply adopted Trimen's ver. no.

hence our difficulties. Onde they are not have be the the part whole whole of the whole operations, here tells the same tale tunce. Both her Rolley show on amount disrespond of dates, number, a factor. Trum stated that we seems a seemnest were cross's trees:

Less roused no objection, but actually adopted the statement;

when he was generation at here home there were were

of course, here is, as usual, a "faction" thating of his.

The source office began he introduction of Herea, and subsequently

to get he assistance of tem. They appear to torse worked together

anicably at food ends to have defend about 18,5. Wickham

was kinds were. I now was he had office han. here it is

alterating toward that Cross was despotched for Herea after

bricklass's arrival.

The New Repuls Do not Deay Cross's serialized, And the Nove of the ser possible. Togs, 2 1878, wrote that Cross's plant "entrobated sur with the our resorres for heathfulter". I find it difficult to suppose that they would have given Cross any crobat if the could have the distribution of the distribution to the distribution of the transition of the tra

But any Bequelle endonce there the second crois a will been cross and have seen franched. I see seen is were in the first in the seen is a fact that the seen is the seen in t

your sincerely.

Dear Mr. Burkill,

Mr. LeGoc. has referred to me your query re Cross's Hevea. We published last year a complete account of all we know about the introduction of Hevea into Ceylon in the Annals of Peradeniya. If you did not receive a copy, will you let me know.

Both consignments of Hevea plants arrived in Ceylon when Thwartes was almost past work. Consequently we have very few records relating to them. It may be said that their location at Henaratgoda was due in great measure to Thwartes increasing infirmities.

But there is no doubt that Ceylon received two consignments of plants, one in 1876 and the other in 1877. It is also certain that no one knows whether these were both planted at Henaratgoda, whether they were planted in separate blocks there, or whether the second consignment was retained at Peradeniya. We suppose that the trees at Henaratgoda are the survivors of both consignments and therefore any seed sent from Henaratgoda is almost as likely to be descended from Cross's trees as from Wickham's.

We sent 400 seeds to Singapore in a Wardian case in 1885, and 11500 seeds in bags in 1888. The latter date is fixed by the Ceylon Botanic Gardens Reports for 1887 & 1888, and Trimen's diaries. But is not all this somewhat superfluous as far as the Singapore trees are concerned. Singapore received plants direct from Kew in 1876. Ridley says these all died but Murton said they did not. Another consignment was sent direct to Singapore in 1877. So Singapore, like Ceylon, received plants of both consignments.

We have always regarded the second consignments to Ceylon and Singapore as Cross's trees. But quite recently Kew has stated that it has no record that Cross's plants ever became fit to send out.

Trimen's statement which you quote was based on data supplied by Dyer in 1880 or 1881. It is true that Dyer did not inform Trimen that the second lot were Cross's trees, but on the other hand he stated "By the time Cross arrived we had done with Hevea"; "we saved I think a Wardian caseful to do justice to Cross". As they gave half the plants to Bull of Chelsea, it is difficult to see where the justice comes in, especially if they never distributed his plants.

The extraordinary thing about this introduction of Hevea is that Kew never wrote any account of it. Dyer furnished data to Trimen who wrote his account of 1881, and when in 1896(°) Kew put out a history of rubber culitvation, they simply adopted Trimen's version. Hence our difficulties. And they are not lessened by the fact that Dyer, who claims to have been in charge of the whole operations, never tells the same tale twice. Both he and Ridley show an amazing disregard of dates, numbers, and facts. Trimen stated that the second consignments were Cross's trees: Kew raised no objection, but actually adopted the statement; now the new generation at Kew claims that Cross's trees were never sent to the East.

Of course, there is, as usual, a "backstair" history of this The India office began the introduction of Hevea, and subsequently sought the assistance of Kew. They appear to have worked together amicably at first but to have differed about 1875. Wickham was Kew's man: Cross was the India office man. And it is interesting to note that Cross was despatched for Hevea after Wickham's arrival.

The Kew Reports do not deny Cross's assistance, but they minimise it as far as possible. Dyer, in 1878, wrote that Cross's plants "contributed but little to air resources for distribution". I find it difficult to suppose that Dyer would have given Cross any credit if he could have avoided it, for I may tell you, in confidence, that Dyer's letters to Trimen exhibit a most virulent animosity towards Cross. It is ludicrous, considering the difference in position of the two men. But any definite evidence that the second consignments were Cross's could only have been furnished by Kew. We have no covering letter so far as I have been able to ascertain. The fact that they were sent with the Ceara trees, which of course were Cross's, is a piece of circumstantial evidence.

Yours sincerely, (sl) T. PETCH.